



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

least the 3,000,000 boys from fourteen to eighteen years of age have the opportunity of learning a little something of the rules and exercises that make men soldiers?", and after this statement adding: "Instruction in military tactics in public and private schools, so far as tried, has been eminently useful to the boys and to their teachers and the Nation, and, therefore, this convention should organize a propaganda to secure the extension of instruction in the high schools until, instead of less than 5 per cent. of the public high schools giving such instruction, there should not be 5 per cent. neglecting such instruction. Also, in the private high schools, so that, instead of less than 15 per cent. in any one of the five divisions of our country that give such instruction, there should be less than 15 per cent. not giving it. Second: In communities where no high schools exist and where boys are continued in the grammar or common schools until they are fifteen or sixteen years of age, this convention should encourage such schools to give military drill, such as is elsewhere given in high schools. Further: That grammar schools should be encouraged to introduce the various 'setting-up exercises', as a valuable and easily arranged gymnastic. Beyond this, as a rule, the grammar school should not attempt any military tactics."

Instead of this, let us adopt the plan of Benjamin Rush and banish all this thought of military drill from every school at once and forever.

America has had many men of whom it may justly be proud, but few of whom it should be more so than of Benjamin Rush.

NEW YORK CITY.

Broadening Patriotism.

BY R. W. H.

The passion called patriotism has ever been directed by what each community, according to circumstances, has marked as the limits of its country.

The earliest accounts of our race show a patriarchal government, where the family tie and the political tie were the same. But as civilization advanced and men, from being nomadic herdsmen, became cultivators of the soil, common interests united them into communities more extensive than that of the family.

Then, though the family interest bound them together, men began to term the communities so separated "countries", and to regard their interests with something of the affection which was formerly bestowed only on the family.

As material civilization advanced, the extent of territory included under single governments increased, but where this civilization was purely material, as among the great Asiatic nations, we do not find that the inhabitants had any very strong feelings on the subject of their nationalities.

Among the Greeks love of country and of countrymen was very intense; but unfortunately for the world, just when a few master minds were beginning to comprehend the unity and rights of at least the whole Hellenic race, material wealth, unaccompanied by true education, ruined the people, and allowed Philip of Macedon to plunge Greece back into barbaric greatness.

The Roman had not even as broad a principle as the Greek. Had a Roman been asked what was the country

whose interests he defended, he would have answered, "All that submits to Rome." The stranger was his enemy, and his enemy had no rights.

It was not until almost our own time that any nation began to recognize the principle which underlies a true conception of our country.

When England, at immense pecuniary sacrifice, abolished her own slave trade, and set her face against it all the world over, she was actuated by the principle that the most degraded have their rights.

In America, we have the broadest conception of a common country that the world has yet seen. Forty-five states, differing in many respects as widely as the European countries, have their foreign relations in common, and call any conflict among themselves civil war.

The Statesman, who would advance his state at the expense of the rest, would not be called a patriot. And the man who advances his country, though it be vast as the United States or should embrace every country of Europe, at the expense of the rest of the World, is not a true patriot. A man's country is the world. The patriot is the philanthropist. All war is civil war, and the only war for which any sort of justification can be offered is war against oppression.

It may be that the great commonwealth of the nations of the earth, which is looked forward to with so much interest, may be but a foreshadowing of a commonwealth of worlds. Then, freed from the bonds of the present material world, we may hope that our country may be boundless as the Universe and we may call every rational creature our countryman.

NEW YORK CITY.

Was the Civil War Necessary?

BY HENRY WOOD.

To speculate upon "What Might Have Been" usually seems to be a superfluous if not an unprofitable undertaking. That the philosophy which is embodied in the familiar aphorism, "Whatever is, is right", has some evolutionary significance and validity it is difficult to gainsay. It is also evident, even upon the surface, that to bewail the mistakes of the past in any pessimistic spirit is a mistake, for the world is coming, more and more, to recognize the usefulness and inspiration of optimism.

Even where there is no difference of opinion regarding its desirability, human progress toward a future ideal is rarely or never made by a direct course, but rather through devious by-ways, where friction is a constant attendant. The educational object-lessons, tests and trials of the race must be had, even at a dear rate, and there is at least one compensation in the fact that those which are expensive are thoroughly learned. It may even be admitted that an experience in evil has a kind of provisional utility, something like the dark background of a picture, where, through contrast, beauty becomes more strongly accentuated.

But there is another very practical side. The lessons of the past have great value in the determination of present duty and the use of future opportunity. While in itself history is a fixed quantity and cannot be undone, it may be invaluable as an interpreter. Said Patrick Henry in his notable speech: "I have but one lamp by

which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

An incident, simple in itself, but of great symbolic significance has recently occurred which has, linked to it, a peculiar retrospective interest and importance. While in the South upon a brief tour, the President of the United States for a short time wore an emblem of the "Southern Confederacy." This notable episode caused great rejoicing and enthusiasm among the people with whom he was then an honored guest, and not much unfavorable comment was made in the North. Thus virtually ended, morally and officially, nearly two score years of hatred, sectionalism, crimination and recrimination, which had continued after the formal close of the physical conflict. This great psychological factor and successor of the war, as a rule, is lightly considered. But in reality, it formed a very substantial addition to the nearly three quarters of a million of lives—the flower of American manhood—and four billions of treasure which are properly chargeable to the Civil War.

In this brief play of the imagination, it is not proposed to enter at all into the history and events of the civil conflict, but only to direct a search-light upon one or two fundamental principles that were involved, and to consider what their possible power might have been, had they been given application. Although the law of non-resistance and a confident trust in the force of moral ideals form the very foundation of the Christian system, as enunciated by its great Expounder, even down to today it cannot be said that any "Christian" government has given them a trial. On the contrary, resistance has been taken to be the only practical living policy.

The cause of the great contest was two irreconcilable theories of government. Slavery was the immediate occasion, but occasions always should be clearly distinguished from causes. From the beginning of our national existence, the conviction had taken firm root in the South, that the State was sovereign, while the power and offices of the central government were assumed to be derived and secondary. The citizen owed his highest and most sacred allegiance to his own Commonwealth. It was an instance where a great unwritten law—so supposed and taken for granted—is more basic in the moral convictions of a people than any specific legislation. Education, tradition, social, political and moral ideals, were all adjusted to such a basis of government. So earnestly was this principle held to be paramount, that soon everything else, ordinarily of supreme moment, was sacrificed in its behalf.

A like intense earnestness prevailed in the North. Although the conditions did not involve a sacrifice equally sweeping during the war which followed, yet the Northern people displayed unlimited patriotism, heroism and a thorough devotion to the principles of a centralized government. The flag was dishonored, the Nation threatened with destruction, and there was, in the Northern view, but one answer, one duty and the response was practically unanimous. This retrospect is made from the standpoint that the North was right, but it is another issue that we are considering.

Suppose the law of non-resistance had been actually applied upon a scale commensurate with the situation, what would have been the result? We must bear in mind the sincerity of the combatants, and also remember

that, whether upon a limited or a colossal scale, resistance begets resistance and that peace and reconciliation are also mutually responsive. The animalism that yet lingers in man is so dominant that he is largely blind to the dynamics of moral ideals and to the contagion of love and non-resistance. To him almost nothing is compelling but brute-force.

In the Spring of 1860 the writer spent some time in Washington and has vivid recollections of the fervid utterances of Toombs, Wigfall, Stephens, Mason and others in the Senate, which re-echoed to the ends of the Nation, and which were potent in kindling those passions of which war is the natural outcome. Threats called out counter threats, and soon reason, argument and conciliation were left behind, and the coming deluge of life, treasure and hatred were ready to pour out. With this brief outline of fundamental premises, we are ready to try to peep behind the curtain of what might have been.

Now in 1899 we stumble upon a few brief historic items written in dreamland. The memoranda run as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 7th, 1861.

A thrilling and impressive scene has taken place today in the halls of Congress. The joint committee of the Senate and House having reported the failure of all the proposed compromises, and that the differences between the two great sections were irreconcilable, the formal withdrawal of the southern members took place at 12 o'clock. Despite all the bitter controversy of many months, there was a peculiar and indescribable pathos in the closing scene, and the end was dramatically solemn. Both sides deprecate its necessity. The South, feeling that its political honor and cherished opinions were at stake would not yield, but the sorrowful faces and, in some cases, tearful eyes of its representatives, as the long procession filed out, arm in arm, gave evidence of great stress and struggle. The Northern members, while firmly feeling the justice of their position, are profoundly convinced of the unwisdom of military coercion, and as an alternative have voted to consent to the separation. The South will make the experiment of a government by itself. The Northern members also passed a resolution, reciting that, "No true loyalty can be forced where none exists in the hearts of the people, and also that the spirit of a real Democracy would indicate that a great section, however mistaken, should have the privilege of voluntary self-government. Recognizing that the cohesive power in a Democracy must consist of interest, affection, sentiment, and social, political and economic ties, rather than authority, we sorrowfully and reluctantly bid adieu to the representatives of our sister states of the South. They go without our enmity, and we tender our fraternal regard." Thus amid the heart-felt regrets of both sides, political necessity divided the United States of America into two great separate but friendly powers.

WASHINGTON D. C., 1863.

Careful observers note a growing sentiment among the press and people of the South in favor of a rehabilitation of the old Union upon the former long established basis. The institution of Slavery appears to be the only obstacle, and there are numerous signs that its power and prestige are steadily crumbling. It is increasingly evident that the evolutionary progress and sentiment of the civilized world make the holding of human chattels

incongruous and abnormal, and its social and economic unprofitableness is now quite generally admitted. The arteries of commerce, intimate business relations, social ties and the annoyance of separate tariff systems all tell strongly for a reunion. Public conventions, especially among business organizations, are being held to agitate the matter, and it is evident that the politicians of both parties are becoming alive to the drift of public opinion.

WASHINGTON, July 4th, 1876.

A proposed amendment to the constitution of the Confederate States, adopted by the Senate and House of said government, declaring that human slavery shall be unlawful after January 1st, 1876, has been ratified by a large popular majority in each of the States forming the Confederacy. From that date all slaves will be absolutely free.

WASHINGTON, D. C., 1870.

The long expected reunion has been formally consummated in the Senate and House to-day. The scene was most dramatic and inspiring. Upon the stroke of the hour of twelve, as the long procession of Southern Senators and Representatives filed into their respective halls, arm in arm, a spontaneous cheer reverberated through the Capitol, and was taken up by the immense crowd outside in a vast and continuous chorus. Cannon boomed, congratulations were everywhere exchanged, and the whole city was astir with a jubilee of rejoicing. Dispatches from all sections told of enthusiastic celebrations in commemoration of the great event in almost every town and city from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Both houses of Congress were almost buried in flowers and the joy upon every face was in striking contrast with the gloom and sorrow of the notable scene of fifteen years before. The educational lesson is complete, and there are no antagonisms to be outgrown. Like two fitting halves of a sphere, the great inter-related sections come together from natural attraction, forming a well rounded and complete Unit.

BOSTON, MASS.

The American Eagle Turning Roman.

Lexington and Bunker Hill will hang in the Historic Gallery of the United States in curious pictorial contrast to the event which took place last Sunday at Manila. We have bartered for, bought, and assumed possession of islands whose former rulers we denounced, quite justly, as cruel tyrants, without giving the slightest recognition in the transaction of any rights of the native inhabitants, without even any consultation with those leaders of the revolt against Spain whom we had allied ourselves with in bringing to an end Spanish control. We were, to a very considerable degree, indebted to Aguinaldo and his troops for the quick ripening of that conquest, which is our sole basis of right to the Philippine Islands. After concluding the Treaty of Paris, our Chief Executive then issued a proclamation of sovereignty over the conquered territory, which was quite without constitutional warrant, for it rested only on the terms of a treaty which lacked the ratification of the Senate. Is it to be wondered at that, having been so grossly deceived as to the honorable intentions of the United States, these men who were approaching what they had thought was the termination of

a long struggle for liberty like our own, and which had our approval, were driven to desperation when they found their efforts had but served to bring about a change of masters. Of Aguinaldo, it will be remembered, Major Bell reported to his superiors, and apparently with judicial fairness, that he was poor, undoubtedly honest, a natural leader, held in respect by his people, but with little education. Whether this report is more to be relied on than that which asserts that he was bought by the Spaniards for \$400,000 is not for us to determine. Until it is disproved we propose to rely on the deliberate statement of a responsible American officer. But if it is true, how can we consistently damn Aguinaldo while clinging to Sam Adams? The Philippine leader struck a blow—pitifully weak and ineffective so far (though we are still to hear from his possible future allies, fever and famine)—for the liberties of his country against an unconstitutional conquest. The day has passed for all of us to admire the blow of the weak struck in defence of liberty; for to some, tyranny with power is sweet, tasted for the first time: the unusual flavor of which is intoxicating, but there was a day when we all admired such protestations against arbitrary power. The American Eagle is moulting; his original feathers are dropping out to be replaced by those of his Roman kinsman—a very different bird. So we have slaughtered 1900 rebels with the same liberty-loving guns that sunk the tyranny of Spain! It was only a step from the noble sentiments of the French Revolution—the “rights of man”, “liberty, equality, fraternity”—to Napoleon, Austerlitz, Jena; and only a few short months from the first to the second battle of Manila. We have considered ourselves (we do not say unwarrantably) the very elect, and above the reach of temptation common to man; but we awake to find ourselves also made of clay. We have what we hold by right of conquest and at the price of blood. We may get more and more possessions after the same fashion. But does that satisfy a people which beat upon its breast continually standing in the temple of moral laws, and thanking God that it was not as other men are?—*City and State*.

We give below the program of the meetings to be held in Tremont Temple, Boston, during March and April, to promote public interest in the coming Peace Conference at The Hague:

March 6, the Rev. Edward Everett Hale will speak on “A Permanent International Tribunal”; March 20, Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, will speak on “Organized Labor’s Contribution to International Peace”; March 27, the Rev. Lyman Abbott will speak on “International Brotherhood”; April 3, the Rev. George C. Lorimer will speak on “The Passing of the War God”, and April 10, the meeting will be in the hands of the women, addressed by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore and others.

Professor William James of Harvard says in reference to what is now going on in the Philippines: “We are now openly engaged in crushing out the sacredest thing in this human world—the attempt of a people long enslaved to attain to the possession of itself, to organize its laws and government, to be free to follow its internal destinies according to its own ideals.”